



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/678,595	10/03/2003	Brian W. Huber	DB000859-007	6161
24122	7590	07/26/2004	EXAMINER	
THORP REED & ARMSTRONG, LLP ONE OXFORD CENTRE 301 GRANT STREET, 14TH FLOOR PITTSBURGH, PA 15219-1425			HUR, JUNG H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2824	

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/678,595	HUBER, BRIAN W.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jung (John) Hur	2824

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 03 October 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>search history</u> . |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it uses the phrase "the present invention" (in lines 1, 2-3, 6 and 7-8) which can be implied. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

It is suggested that, for example, in line 1, the phrase "[t]he present invention is directed to" be deleted, and the phrase "a method and apparatus for providing" be replaced with --A method and an apparatus provide--. In lines 2-3, it is suggested that "One aspect of the present invention relates to a pre-driver or the like which provides" be replaced with --In one aspect, a pre-driver or the like provides--. Similar changes are suggested for other occurrences of "the present invention" in the abstract.

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

In paragraph 1 of the specification, the status of the application 09/792,554 should be updated; namely, said application has been abandoned.

Appropriate correction is required.

4. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In line 2, the claim recites “a plurality of transistor output stages” (emphasis added) for the first data path, while, in line 3, it recites “a plurality of output stages” for the second data path, which appears to be inconsistent. It is suggested that either “transistor” in line 2 be deleted, or replace “output stages” in line 3 with --transistor output stages--.

Appropriate correction is required.

5. Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In lines 7-8, the claim twice recites the limitation “said pair”, but it is unclear whether the limitation is referring to the first pair or the second pair. It will be understood as --each of said pairs--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Thaik (U.S. Pat. No. 5,285,116).

Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), Thaik in Figs. 4-7 discloses a pre-driver (24 and 26 in Fig. 4) providing an unbalanced output drive capability, comprising:

a first data path (24 in Fig. 4) having a plurality of transistor output stages (including columns of transistors in Fig. 5A); a second data path (26 in Fig. 4) having a plurality of output stages (including columns of transistors in Fig. 6B);

and a plurality of switches (where a “switch” is distinguished from a “transistor” and broadly interpreted as a unit that may include multiple transistors that are commonly controlled by a signal, such as N2 or N3 in Figs. 5A and 6B), each switch (for example, a switch comprising 51 and 102 commonly controlled by N2, similar to a double-pole, single-throw switch unit) for controlling (via, for example, N2) the conductivity of a pair (for example, the lower second columns of Figs. 5A and 6B) of the plurality of output stages in response to the level of conductivity of a subsequent driver output stage (or, to signals indicative of the strength of the output transistors in an output device) (for example, N2 is derived from an output buffer 20; see for example column 16, lines 4-6),

wherein one of said pair of output stages is connected to said first data path (for example, the lower second column of Fig. 5A within 24) and another of said pair of output stages is connected to said second data path (for example, the lower second column of Fig. 6B within 26).

In the alternative, under 35 U.S. C. 103(a), if the “switch” above is interpreted as a switching “transistor” (with reference to 114 or 116 in Fig. 7 of the instant application), Thaik fails to disclose the limitation “each switch” as recited in claims 1 and 6; however, the Thaik’s combination of 51 in Fig. 5A and 102 in Fig. 6B, both controlled by N2, would be an obvious variant of “each switch” as recited in claims 1 and 6, since both variants control the conductivity of a pair of output stages in different data paths simultaneously via a common control signal.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Thaik (U.S. Pat. No. 5,285,116).

Thaik in Figs. 4-7 discloses a method of providing an unbalanced output drive capability to correct for output skews in subsequent amplification stages, comprising:

providing a plurality of output drive/pre-driver stages (for example, columns of transistors in Figs. 5A and 6B) on a first data path and on a second data path (24 and 26 in Fig. 4, respectively);

generating a two-bit code/signal (for example, N2 and N3) representative of the relative strength of an n-channel and a p-channel transistor in an output device (including 28, 30, 32, 34,

and 36 in Fig. 4; see also, for example, column 16, lines 4-6 which discloses that the signals N2 and N3 are derived from an output buffer 20 in Fig. 4, which includes the output device);

controlling in pairs, or enabling, the number of output drive/pre-driver stages on said first and second data paths that are activated (for example, N2 and N3 activate in pairs the output stages in Figs. 5A and 6B) in response to the amount of skew represented by the two-bit code/signal (see, for example, column 5, lines 62-64), wherein at least a first pair (for example, the lower first columns of Figs. 5A and 6B) of said output stages is controlled by the first bit (for example, N3) of said two-bit signal and at least a second pair (for example, the lower second columns of Figs. 5A and 6B) of said output stages is controlled by the second bit (for example, N2) of said two-bit signal, and wherein one output stage of each of said pairs is connected to said first data path (for example, the lower second column of Fig. 5A in 24) and another of each of said pairs of output stages is connected to said second data path (for example, the second column of Fig. 6B in 26), wherein said pre-driver produces an unbalanced output from the pre-driver (for example, the output DN1 in Fig. 5A; column 6, lines 36-38);

and inputting a data signal to the output device through the pre-driver (in Fig. 4, DATA SIGNAL is inputted to the output device through 24 and 26, which include Figs. 5A and 6B).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ong (U.S. Pat. No. 5,798,970) in view of Thaik (U.S. Pat. No. 5,285,116).

Regarding claims 7-9, Ong discloses a computer system (Fig. 3), comprising: a processor (108 in Fig. 3) having a processor bus (112, 110, and the bus from 108 to 102 and 104); an input device (102 in Fig. 3) coupled to the processor through the processor bus; an output device (104 in Fig. 3) coupled to the processor through the processor bus; a memory device (114 in Fig. 3) coupled (via 116 in Fig. 3) to the processor bus, the memory device comprising (column 9, lines 50-65): a plurality of memory cells arranged in an array of rows and columns (column 9, lines 52-55); a plurality of devices for identifying cells within the array (column 9, lines 56-58); a plurality of pads (data terminals, column 9, lines 50-52); a data path connecting the plurality of pads and the array (column 9, lines 59-60), the data path comprising an output driver responsive to a data signal (column 9, lines 61-65).

Ong does not disclose a pre-driver providing an unbalanced output drive capability, comprising: a first pre-driver data path having a plurality of output transistors; a second pre-driver data path having a plurality of output transistors; and a plurality of switches, each switch for controlling the conductivity of a pair of said plurality of output transistors in response to signals indicative of the strength of output transistors in said output driver, wherein one of said pair of output transistors is connected to said first pre-driver data path and another of said pair of output transistors is connected to said second pre-driver data path, said pre-driver providing said data signal to said output driver.

Thaik discloses a pre-driver as in claims 1 and 6 above.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the computer system of Ong by incorporating the pre-driver of Thaik, for the purpose of controlling the switching speed with maximum efficiency across process, temperature and supply voltage variations (Thaik, column 1, lines 6-13).

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Dicke (U.S. Pat. No. 5,010,256) discloses a driver with a plurality of slew-rate controlled output stages.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jung (John) Hur whose telephone number is (571) 272-1870. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30 AM - 3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Elms can be reached on (571) 272-1869. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jhh



RICHARD ELMS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800